

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE | | NG DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| 09/403,131 02/19/2000 | | Jens Eckermann | H01.2-8601 | 6871 | | |
| ; | 7590 12/17/2003 | | | | EXAMINER | |
| Vidas Arrett | & Steinki | aus | HARMON, CHI | HARMON, CHRISTOPHER R | | |
| Suite 200 6109 Blue Circ | cle Drive | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| Minnetonka 1 | MN 5534 | 3-9131 | 3721 | | | |

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

22

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

 $i \mathcal{T}_i$

| | | | | Amuliaanda | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | | eation No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
| | | | 3,131 | ECKERMANN ET AL. | | | |
| | | | ner | Art Unit | | | |
| | | | pher R Harmon | 3721 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sheet with the correspond nce address Period for Reply | | | | | | | |
| THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any r | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provision SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (a) period for reply is specified above, the maximum is re to reply within the set or extended period for reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no munication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory period will apply ar y will, by statute, cause the | o event, however, may a reply b statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f application to become ABANDO | e timely filed days will be considered timely. rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| 1)⊠ | Responsive to communication(s) fil | ed on <u>31 October 2</u> | <u>2003</u> . | | | | |
| 2a)⊠ | This action is FINAL . | 2b)□ This action is | s non-final. | | | | |
| 3)□ | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ | ✓ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) 1-3,7-9 and 11-20 is/are rejected. ✓ Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| | ion Papers | | • | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | | |
| 12) △ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) △ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. △ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. | | | | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) | DTO 0483 | | ary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) | | | |
| | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) | | 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other: | al Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/403,131 Page 2

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

 This application contains claims 4-6 drawn to an invention nonelected without traverse in Paper No. 18. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancelation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 12-13 are objected to because of the following informalities: "tone off" (claim 12) and "adhesing" (claim 13) should be corrected. Appropriate correction is required. Furthermore, method steps should be positively recited ie. multi-piece packagings are releasably fastened to side walls of said transport box by attached perforated wall sections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "and removing their longitudinal side walls from the longitudinal web" is confusing the bottle holders would thereafter not include side walls (after removal).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 7-9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reichert (US 4,055,943) in view of Meyers (US 4,177,715).

Reichert discloses a method for packing containers 30 into open cases/transport boxes comprising loading bottles 30 through openings in collar/multiplece packaging 95 into boxes 108; see figure 2.

Reichert does not disclose erecting the cases with releasably fastening a multipiece packaging inside (adhering) to a flat lying box, however Meyers teaches construction and use of a collapsed flat lying blank with a multiplece packaging 60 inserted; see figure 5. The combined structure undergoes folding and gluing operations and formed into a collapsed tubular blank. The blanks are then set up or erected before use. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a box erecting method as taught by Meyers in the invention to Reichert in order to save space.

Lateral walls are hinged to one another and folded about fold lines of sidewalls.

Regarding claim 9, multi-piece packaging is not releasably fastened on lid flaps however at the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of Art Unit: 3721

design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to fasten the insert on lid flaps because Applicant has not disclosed that the particular box construction provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. One of ordinary skill in the art, furthermore, would have expected Applicant's invention to perform equally well with fastening to the sidewalls because the bottles are inserted equally well.

Regarding claim 11, the examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE that perforation lines provided in bottle packagings are well known in the art an would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide a blank with an insert with perforated sections.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 10 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 3721

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Christopher R Harmon whose telephone number is
703-308-8643. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from
8-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 703-308-2187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

ch